

## REMARKS

In this application, a final rejection was issued on March 23, 2004.

In the noted final rejection, claims 1-5 and 10 are indicated as being withdrawn and claims 6-8 and 11 as rejected. In addition, claims 6 and 11 are objected to. The examiner has suggested an amendment to claims 6 and 11 to overcome the objection. Claims 6 and 11 have been amended as suggested by the examiner to overcome this objection.

The rejection of claims 6-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph; and the rejection of claims 6 and 7 as anticipated by Cross et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and of claim 8 as obvious over Cross et al. in view of JP 2218509 are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, it is respectfully submitted that the phrases "stationary edge 52a" and "stationary edge 52b" are not unclear, but understandable in the proper context.

The edges 52a and 52b are properly understood as "stationary" relative to the other edges of the moveable blade part 50, 50 and not to the edges 13a, 14b and 15a and 16a of the stationary blade part 10. If the proper point of reference is applied, the lack of clarity disappears.

Regarding the rejection of 35 USC 112, second paragraph, it is respectfully submitted that the terms "front" and "rear" are to be understood not with respect to the direction of the feeding direction of the blade material but with respect to the support faces of the stationary blade. When so viewed, the use of these terms is, it is respectfully submitted, proper.

Regarding Cross et al, at the very least, there are no movable blade parts which move relative to each other. This distinction is also lacking in the Japanese reference as well.

The two applied references are being stretched, it is respectfully submitted, beyond their reasonable limits in the noted rejections. Elements are being construed in a way contrary to the intent of their very disclosures. It is therefore, respectfully

U.S. Pat. Appl. 09/926,384


submitted that claims 6 - 8 identify structure which is lacking in the applied references.

The indication that claim 11 contains allowable subject matter is appreciated. Claim 11 has been amended as suggested by the examiner so that it is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is urged to consider the above in this continuing examination and find claims 6 - 8 allowable along with claim 11.

Date: September 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,  
**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**



Felix J. D'Ambrasio  
Registration No: 25,721

**BACON & THOMAS**  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Osaka International, Suzue Patent\MIZU3002\Amend of Sept 23 2004.wpd